UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,529	10/06/2003	Jeffrey Wilson	930028-2002	3965

20999 7590 11/20/2007

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER	
SANTIAGO CORDERO, MARIVELISSE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/679,529	Applicant(s) WILSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Marivelisse Santiago-Cordero	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-18 and 20-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-18 and 20-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/07 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the address being modified **by** the GW) (Remarks: page 9, 3rd full paragraph) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claim only requires the signal processing means to provide a modified address, not to modify an address.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-2, 3-18, and 20-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 1, 17, and 21, the limitation "wherein the modified address is used instead of an address from the HLR" was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the Remarks, Applicant stated that support for the amendment could be found throughout the specification as originally filed. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The specification does disclose the SMS Router may then respond on behalf of the HLR, but instead of directing the MT text message to the destination mobile as the HLR would have done, the router directs the MT message to be routed to an SMS Router in Network B (Specification: page 8, lines 19-22). That is to say that the SMS Router directs the message to another SMS Router, instead of directing it to the destination mobile. However, this is different from what is being claimed, i.e., wherein the modified address is used instead of an address from the HLR. The SMS Router directing the message to another SMS Router, instead of directing it to the destination mobile does not exclude the modified address to come from the HLR.

Applicant is welcomed to point out where in the specification the Examiner can find support for this limitation, if Applicant believes otherwise.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 4, 7, and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Luukko et al. (hereinafter "Ala-Luukko"; WO 01/22751 A1) in view of Allison et al. (Patent No.: US 7,222,192).

Regarding claim 1, Ala-Luukko discloses a method of controlling delivery of text messages to a subscriber in a telecommunications services apparatus, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a mode of delivery from a plurality of delivery modes by the subscriber for at least one selected from the group consisting of (i) a future text message and (ii) a category of future text messages (page 2, lines 15-20; page 3, lines 12-21; page 4, lines 8-15; page 4, lines 2-4; note that forwarding to another number is the mode of delivery; and sending normally with no forward-to number is another mode of delivery);

implementing the selected mode of delivery by a message processing means (Fig. 3, references SMSC and VMSC3, either alone or in combination; Fig. 6, references SMSC and VMSC, either alone or in combination; page 11, line 35 through page 12, line 4; note that if subscriber B enables forwarding to a forward-to number, the SMSC/VMSC sends/routes the message to the relevant subscriber; thus, implementing the requested selection) which is part of a home network with which the subscriber's mobile telephone is associated (Figs. 3 and 6),

wherein text messages intended by a sender (Fig. 1, reference TE1; Fig. 6, note the sender of MO-SM 60) for delivery to said subscriber (Fig. 1, reference TE2; Figs. 3-5, references 31, 41, 52), are directed to the message processing means which then implements the selected delivery mode (Figs. 3 and 6; page 11, line 35 through page 12, line 4; note that if subscriber B enables forwarding to a forwarded-to number, the SMSC/VMSC sends/routes the message to the relevant subscriber; thus, implementing the delivery mode previously selected by the subscriber);

intercepting a routing query from another network (Figs. 5-6, reference 61; page 2, lines 32-35; page 4, lines 16-29; page 11, lines 15-20) made in response to a request from a user associated with said another network (Figs. 5-6, reference 60; page 2, lines 32-35; page 4, lines 16-29) by a signal processing means provided in said home network (Fig. 6, reference GW);

detecting by the signal processing means that the subscriber has selected a mode of delivery (Fig. 6; page 11, lines 22-25); and

providing by the signal processing means, in response to the routing query on behalf of an HLR (home location register) of the home network (Fig. 6, reference 66; page 11, lines 31-33 and 35 through page 12, line 4), a modified address (Fig. 5; page 11, lines 31-33 and 35 through page 12, line 4; note the forward-to number) which causes the text message from said another network to be directed to said message processing means for implementation of said delivery mode (Figs. 3 and 6; note the "Forward SM", references 32 and 67; page 9, lines 11-18),

wherein the modified address is used (Fig. 5; page 11, lines 31-33 and 35 through page 12, line 4; note the forward-to number).

Ala-Luukko fails to specifically disclose instead of an address from the HLR.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Allison discloses wherein the modified address is used instead of an address from the HLR (col. 17, lines 9-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to use the modified address instead of an address from the HLR as suggested by Allison for de advantages of reducing signaling message traffic and call setup time and provides increased functionality (Allison: Abstract; col. 18, lines 15-19).

Regarding claim 2, in the obvious combination Ala-Luukko discloses in which the message processing means is an SMS router (Figs. 3 and 6; reference SMSC and VMSC either alone or in combination; page 11, line 35 through page 12, line 4; note that the SMSC and VMSC routes the short message).

Regarding claim 4, in the obvious combination Ala-Luukko discloses in which the signal processing means is an SMS router (page 9, lines 11-19; note that the gateway (i.e., signal processing means) transmits the short message back to SMSC, i.e., routes the short message).

Regarding claim 7, in the obvious combination Ala-Luukko discloses in which one of the delivery modes which is available is a mode providing diversion of messages to an alternative mobile number (page 2, lines 15-20; page 9, lines 17-15).

Regarding claim 17, Ala-Luukko discloses a telecommunications network comprising:

a message processing means (Fig. 3, references SMSC and VMSC3, either alone or in combination; Fig. 6, references SMSC and VMSC, either alone or in combination; page 11, line 35 through page 12, line 4) to implement the selected mode of delivery on receipt by the message processing means of a text message (Figs. 3 and 6; page 11, line 35 through page 12, line 4; note that if subscriber B enables forwarding to a forward-to number, the SMSC/VMSC sends/routes

the message to the relevant subscriber; thus, implementing the previously selected mode of delivery), intended for receipt by said subscriber (Fig. 1, reference TE2; Figs. 3-5, references 31, 41, 52), by forwarding the message to at least one delivery path of the message processing means (Figs. 3 and 6);

an HLR (home location register) (Figs. 3 and 6, reference HLR); and

a signal processing means (Figs. 3 and 6, reference GW), said signal processing means (Figs. 3 and 6, reference GW) being configured in association with the HLR (Figs. 3 and 5-6) to intercept routing queries sent to the HLR of said network from another network (Figs. 5-6, reference 61; page 2, lines 32-35; page 4, lines 16-29; page 11, lines 15-20), for receiving a text message from such another network (page 2, lines 32-35; page 4, lines 16-29; page 11, lines 15-20), to detect that the subscriber has previously made a selection as to a chosen mode of delivery (Fig. 6; page 11, lines 22-25) and to communicate with the HLR (Figs. 5-6, reference 62 and 63) but to provide a modified address (Figs. 3, 5-6; page 11, lines 31-33 and 35 through page 12, line 4; note the forward-to number) which will cause the text message from said another network to be sent to the message processing means which will then effect delivery in accordance with a previously selected mode or modes of delivery (Figs. 3 and 6; note the "Forward SM", references 32 and 67; page 9, lines 11-18),

wherein the modified address is used (Fig. 5; page 11, lines 31-33 and 35 through page 12, line 4; note the forward-to number).

Ala-Luukko fails to specifically disclose the message processing means capable of storing a selection of at least one selectable mode of delivery of a text message made by a

subscriber to a network incorporating the message processing means; and wherein the modified address is used **instead of an address from the HLR**.

However, in an alternate embodiment, Ala-Luukko does suggests the message processing means (Fig. 4; reference SMSC) that is capable of storing a selection of at least one selectable mode of delivery of a text message made by a subscriber to a network incorporating the message processing means (Fig. 4; page 9, line 23 through page 10, line 6; note that the database DB shown in Fig. 1, can be implemented in the message processing means).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by Applicant to store in the message processing means of Ala-Luukko a selection of at least one selectable mode of delivery of a text message made by a subscriber to a network incorporating the message processing means as suggested by Ala-Luukko for the advantages of saving signaling capacity (Ala-Luukko; page 10, lines 14-15).

In addition, in the same field of endeavor, Allison discloses wherein the modified address is used instead of an address from the HLR (col. 17, lines 9-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to use the modified address instead of an address from the HLR as suggested by Allison for de advantages of reducing signaling message traffic and call setup time and provides increased functionality (Allison: Abstract; col. 18, lines 15-19).

Regarding claim 18, in the obvious combination, Ala-Luukko discloses in which the message processing means is an SMS router (Figs. 3-4 and 6; reference SMSC and VMSC either alone or in combination; page 11, line 35 through page 12, line 4; note that the SMSC and VMSC routes the short message).

Regarding claim 20, in the obvious combination, Ala-Luukko discloses in which the signal processing means is an SMS router (page 9, lines 11-19; note that the gateway (i.e., signal processing means) transmits the short message back to SMSC, i.e., routes the short message).

Regarding claim 21, Ala-Luukko discloses a telecommunications services apparatus comprising:

a home location register (HLR) (Fig. 6, reference HLR);

a signal processing means (Fig. 6, reference GW) configured to intercept routing queries sent to the HLR of one network from another network (Fig. 6, reference 61; page 2, lines 32-35; page 4, lines 16-29; page 11, lines 15-20, 31-33 and 35 through page 12, line 4), the signal processing means being configured to detect that a subscriber has previously made a selection as to a chosen mode of delivery (Fig. 6; page 2, lines 15-20; page 3, lines 12-21; page 4, lines 8-15; page 4, lines 2-4; page 11, lines 22-25; note that forwarding to another number is the mode of delivery) and to communicate with the HLR (Fig. 6, references 62 and 63) to provide a modified address which will cause a text message from said another network to be sent (Figs. 3 and 6; note the "Forward SM", references 32 and 67; page 9, lines 11-18) to a message processing means (Fig. 3, references SMSC and VMSC3, either alone or in combination; Fig. 6, references SMSC and VMSC, either alone or in combination; page 11, line 35 through page 12, line 4), the message processing means being operative to effect delivery in accordance with a mode or modes of delivery previously selected by a recipient of the message (Figs. 3 and 6; note the "Forward SM", references 32 and 67; page 9, lines 11-18 and line 35 through page 12, line 4; note that if subscriber B enables forwarding to a forward-to number, the SMSC/VMSC

sends/routes the message to the relevant subscriber; thus, effect delivery in accordance with a mode or modes of delivery previously selected by a recipient of the message),

wherein the modified address is used (Fig. 5; page 11, lines 31-33 and 35 through page 12, line 4; note the forward-to number).

Ala-Luukko fails to specifically disclose instead of an address from the HLR.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Allison discloses wherein the modified address is used instead of an address from the HLR (col. 17, lines 9-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to use the modified address instead of an address from the HLR as suggested by Allison for de advantages of reducing signaling message traffic and call setup time and provides increased functionality (Allison: Abstract; col. 18, lines 15-19).

Regarding claim 22, in the obvious combination, Ala-Luukko discloses in which the signal processing means is an SMS router (page 9, lines 11-19; note that the gateway (i.e., signal processing means) transmits the short message back to SMSC, i.e., routes the short message).

7. Claims 5, 8-9, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Astrom et al. (hereinafter "Astrom"; cited in form PTO-892, paper no. 20050725).

Regarding claim 5, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above), but fails to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes which is available is a mode providing a delayed message delivery during selected hours of the day.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Astrom discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing a delayed message delivery during selected hours of the day (col. 3, lines 49-53; note the scheduled delivery of the message).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide a delayed message delivery during selected hours of the day in the delivery mode of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison as suggested by Astrom for the advantage of allowing the recipient to receive the message when he/she is available or less occupied.

Regarding claim 8, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above), in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing diversion of messages (Ala-Luukko: page 3, lines 12-14; note that forwarding messages is a mode providing diversion of messages), but fail to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing diversion of messages on a time of day basis.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing diversion of messages on a time of day basis (col. 3, lines 49-53; note the scheduled delivery of the message).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide diversion of messages on a time of day basis in the delivery mode of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison as suggested by Astrom for the advantage of allowing the recipient to receive the message when he/she is available or less occupied.

Regarding claim 9, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above), but fail to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call (col. 3, lines 49-53; note the media conversion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call in one of the delivery modes of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison as suggested by Astrom for the advantages of audibly notifying the recipient.

Regarding claim 11, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above), but fail to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing filtering of messages by address information or content.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing filtering of messages by address information or content (col. 3, lines 53-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide filtering of messages by address information or content call in one of the delivery modes of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison as suggested by Astrom for the advantage of screening out annoying advertisements (Astrom: col. 3, lines 53-55).

Regarding claim 12, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above), but fail to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by fax.

However, Astrom, in the same field of endeavor, discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by fax (col. 2, lines 18-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide delivery by fax in one of the delivery modes of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison as suggested by Astrom for the advantage of converting the message to a desired delivery media (Astrom: col. 2, lines 18-23) that is more convenient to the user.

8. Claims 6, 9, 12-13, 16, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Skladman et al. (hereinafter "Skladman"; cited in form PTO-892, paper no. 20050725).

Regarding claim 6, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above), but fails to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing diversion of text messages to fixed line when the subscriber is in a home cell.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes which is available is a mode providing diversion of text messages to fixed line when the subscriber is in a home cell (pages 3-4; paragraph [0044]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide diversion of text messages to fixed line when the subscriber is in a home cell in one of the delivery modes of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison as

suggested by Skladman for delivering over any or all of the available communication networks, depending on the preferences of the respective users (Skladman: page 4, paragraph [0048]).

Regarding claim 9, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison discloses the method of claim 1 (see above), but fails to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call.

However, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call (page 4, paragraphs [0053]-[0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide conversion of messages to voice for delivery in a voice call of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of audibly notifying the recipient (Skladman: page 4, paragraph [0055]).

Regarding claim 12, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above), but fails to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by fax.

However, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by fax (pages 4-5; paragraph [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide delivery by fax in one of the delivery modes of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of converting the message to a desired delivery media.

Regarding claim 13, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison discloses the method of claim 1 (see above), but fails to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by e-mail.

However, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by e-mail (pages 3-4; paragraph [0044]; pages 4-5; paragraph [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide delivery by e-mail in one of the delivery modes of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of allowing the recipient to view the message wherever Internet is available.

Regarding claim 16, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison discloses the method of claim 1 (see above), but fails to specifically disclose in which the subscriber makes the selection by means of an interactive voice call.

However, Skladman discloses in which the subscriber makes the selection by means of an interactive voice call (pages 5-6, paragraph [0063]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to make the selection of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison by means of an interactive voice call as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of permitting the user to enter the information, preferences and selections in a simple and efficient manner available wherever a telephone is present.

Regarding claim 23, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison disclose the method of claim 1 (see above), but fail to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by voice call.

However, Skladman discloses in which one of the delivery modes, which is available, is a mode providing delivery by voice call (page 4, paragraph [0055]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide one of the delivery modes of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison delivery by voice call as suggested by Skladman for the advantage of audibly notifying the recipient (Skladman: page 4, paragraph [0055]).

9. Claims 10 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Alperovich et al. (hereinafter "Alperovich", cited in form PTO-892, paper no. 20050725).

Regarding claim 10, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison disclose discloses the method of claim 1 (see above), but fails to specifically disclose in which one of the delivery modes which is available is a mode providing special handling of some messages according to originator number.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Alperovich discloses in which one of the delivery modes which is available is a mode providing special handling of some messages according to originator number (col. 1, lines 55-57; col. 1, line 63 through col. 2, line 9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to provide special handling of some messages of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison according to originator number as suggested by Alperovich for the advantages of specifying from which senders messages will be accepted or rejected, a utility that saves both time and money (Alperovich: col. 1, lines 45-57).

Regarding claim 14, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison discloses the method of claim 1 (see above), but fails to specifically disclose in which the subscriber makes the selection by a USSD command. However, Ala-Luukko does suggest this feature in page 4, lines 7-15.

Nevertheless, in the same field of endeavor, Alperovich discloses in which the subscriber makes the selection by a USSD command (Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to makes the selection of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison by a USSD command as suggested by Alperovich for the advantages of interactively transmitting the selection (Alperovich: col. 5, lines 56-64), and for the advantages of being a standard for transmitting information over GSM signaling channels (note that Ala-Luukko discloses a GSM network).

Regarding claim 15, Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison discloses the method of claim 1 (see above), but fails to specifically disclose in which the subscriber makes the selection by an SMS.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Alperovich discloses in which the subscriber makes the selection by an SMS (from col. 5, line 67 through col. 6, line 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to makes the selection of Ala-Luukko in combination with Allison by an SMS as suggested by Alperovich for the advantages of being a widely available and notoriously-well known in the art for communicating text messages with another terminal and/or system without establishing a circuit connection.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marivelisse Santiago-Cordero whose telephone number is (571) 272-7839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (571) 272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

msc 11/14/07

MSC

WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600